

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended as set forth above to put the application into condition for allowance. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

I. Examiner Interview Dated October 10, 2007

An interview was held on October 10, 2007. Applicants believe that an agreement as to allowability has been reached. After full consideration of the amendment, if there are any further outstanding issues, Examiner Pham agreed to another interview to resolve the issues.

II. Removal of Reference for purposes of 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The current application and U.S. Patent No. 6,654,741 were, at the time of the invention of the current application, owned by Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Washington. This statement alone is sufficient evidence to establish common ownership. See MPEP 706.02(l)(2)(II).

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 15 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. The Office Action asserts that the feature "interpreting a format specifier associated with the patterned URL," was not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification recites "interpret operation **420** comprises interpreting the characters of the detected pattern in the patterned URL based on the data source type and the format specifier. Details of interpreting the pattern based on the data source type and the format specifier will be discussed below with reference to FIGs 5 and 6." *Specification* at pg. 12, lines 10-13. FIGURES 6 and the associated text give exemplary aspects of interpreting a format specifier associated with the patterned URL. Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because the feature "the destination URL" is unclear as to what destination URL is being referenced. Claim 1 is also

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because it is unclear what is being referenced by the copied character. Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because the feature "the service" lacks antecedent basis. The claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 15, 17, 18, 23-29, 31, 32 and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,654,741 issued to Cohen et al. (hereinafter "Cohen"). Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of EP No. 1,160,692 issued to Ong (hereinafter "Ong"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Cohen has been removed as a references under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as set forth above. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-14 are in condition for allowance in that they were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Cohen. The Office Action states that Cohen does not teach "sending the destination URL to the user system for redirecting the user system." This feature has been associated with the other independent claims as set forth above. In that Cohen cannot be considered under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), claims 15, 17-29, and 31-42 are also in condition for allowance.

App. No. 10/660,899
Amendment Dated: October 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 18, 2007

V. Request for Reconsideration.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Ryan T. Grace

Registration No. 52,956

Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE